UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,848	05/09/2001	Andrew C. Gilbert	CF/033	3671
64558 FISH & NEAV	7590 04/24/2007 VE IP GROUP	07	EXAMINER	
ROPES & GRA	AY LLP		AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
1211 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036-8704			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•	•		04/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/851,848	GILBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olabode Akintola	3691	

	Ciaboac / ikintola	0001	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence ad	dress
THE REPLY FILED 12 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendm stice of Appeal (with appeal f	ent, affidavit, or other evide ee) in compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		EN THE FIRST REPLY WAS	FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding a shortened statutory period for re r than three months after the ma	amount of the fee. The approp ply originally set in the final O	oriate extension fee ffice action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37	(e)), to avoid dismissal of	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (s		because
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ially reducing or simplifying	g the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ally rejected claims.	
		Ion Compliant Amandman	+ (DTOL 224)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ion-compliant Amenumen	((F 1 OL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		will be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections unde	r appeal and/or appellant f	ails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims	after entry is below or attac	ched.
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	ut does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for allow	ance because:
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SR/08) Paner No(s)	1 //	./
13. Other:	Www.	mille Och 200	nor.
	ALE	XANDER KALINOWSKI	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 4/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the 112, second paragraph rejection is not proper. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The outcome of the cancellation request is not recited. It is not clear whether the request was successful or not, thereby making the claim in this present form indefinite or open ended. In claims 1 and 32, there is a missing link between the request to cancel and the replacement of the first bid or offer with a second bid or offer. A request to cancel is different from a request to replace a first bid or offer. A request to cancel a bid or offer can be done even without the step of receiving a second bid or offer.

The second part of the 112, second paragraph rejection (i.e., "time frame") is hereby withdrawn

Applicant argues that Alaia fails to teach, "suspending an order as a result of the order being received during a cooling off period". Examiner respectful asserts the claim in its present form still reads on the Alaia reference as stated in the final rejection. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicants' invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "suspending an order as a result of the order being received during a cooling off period") is not recited in the rejected claim(s). The claim simply recites "suspending the order to buy or sell the item for the buyer or seller to notice a change in the first bid or offer and the second bid or offer price". Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).